

## "A Good Soldier of Christ"

JOSEPH W. DINAND, S.J.

*The Eulogy Delivered in St. Michael's Cathedral, October 8, 1920, at the Funeral of the Rt. Rev. Thomas D. Beaven, D. D., Bishop of Springfield.*

**L**ABOR as a good soldier of Christ Jesus." II. Tim. 2:3. In a little panel of the stained-glass window in the oratory of the episcopal residence there is this simple brief Latin inscription: "*Labora sicut bonus miles Christi Jesu*": "Labor as a good soldier of Christ Jesus."

Whenever it was my privilege to kneel in that quiet little sanctuary, close up to the presence of the living God in the tabernacle, invariably my eyes turned to that text and in my heart I thought how the great man resting there exemplified in his life this apostolic virtue.

The words here addressed by St. Paul to Timothy, after he had consecrated him Bishop of Ephesus and Metropolitan of Asia, in his love and solicitude for his "son in Christ," fired the heart of Paul to encourage Timothy for the great work that was before him in his pastoral office. And among the great virtues typical of his episcopal state, he held out as of the very essence of his high station the spirit of fortitude, "*Labora*," in the Greek text, the very word used by St. Paul signifies, "endure hardships or suffering"; the "*Bonus miles*" in the original Greek is "*kalos*," signifying not merely a good soldier but renowned, brave, heroic.

The time set on the dial of God for this pendulum of life to stop was within the octave of St. Michael, the valiant soldier of God, in the day of battle.

The Cathedral over which this chosen soul was set in the day of his consecration, was dedicated to St. Michael, God's champion, amid armed "hosts": "Who is like to God." The episcopal arms of this diocese tell it: "*Michael salutis signifer*": "Michael standard-bearer of salvation!" Fortitude and heroism are the watchwords of this life that is today the subject of our thoughts and the very breath of our souls.

This splendid city of Springfield has witnessed the ushering into life of the soul of Thomas Daniel Beaven in 1851; sturdy, rugged simplicity marked those earlier days and left the impress of their character upon this life. His Faith came to him from that race that knew the value of the treasure that was their inheritance and whose heroism and fortitude have been the sterling qualities of their lives.

The records of Holy Cross bear this simple entry, which I have read with my own eyes: "Sept. 9, 1862, entered this day as a boarder, Thomas Daniel Beaven, son of Thomas Beaven of Springfield, Mass." On the walls of the Bishop's room in Holy Cross hangs a simple little frame enclosing a priceless document, given to the college a few short years ago, reverently kept by a dear good mother and found after her death among her papers, neatly folded away, "Holy Mary, Immaculate Virgin, Mother of God, I, Thomas D. Beaven, choose Thee this day for my Mother, Queen, Patroness and Advocate . . . and I firmly resolve never to depart from the duty I owe to Thee either in word, or in action, nor to suffer those who are committed to my charge to say or do anything against Thy honor and the respect which Thou deservest . . . In the year of Our Lord, 1865, this 8th Day of December—Aged 14 years."

The seal of God's approval was on this innocent soul; he was destined for the call that led him "to leave father and mother, yea, and all he had in the world for Christ's sake." The doors of the Grand Seminary of Montreal were opened to receive him. The solicitude, holiness and learning of Sulpicians Fathers molded his character in the ways of the sanctuary. Their example of daily virtue led on his impressionable soul to the deep appreciation of the dignity of the priesthood. To this noble body of saintly men belongs the glory of forming this soul for the greater duties of life and for the supreme dignity of the priesthood. For the Fathers of St. Sulpice he ever cherished an abiding affection and a reverence that found expression later in the confidence with which he intrusted into their keeping the formation of the clergy of his diocese.

Spencer bears today the fruit of the seed he sowed in his thirteen years of priestly labors. His ten years' pastorate of St. Mary's gave him unbounded scope for his zeal and unbounded tenderness for the charge committed unto him.

#### CONSECRATED BISHOP.

The Church of the Holy Rosary, Holyoke, was the fruitful field of his four years of solicitude, and here while performing his duties of pastor, on the feast of St. Ignatius, July 31, 1892, he was appointed Bishop and was consecrated Bishop of Springfield on Oct. 18, 1892.

The Spouse of Christ, Holy Mother Church, prayed Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, "to promote this priest here present to the burdens of the episcopate." The head was bowed for the anointing and from that moment, memory, will and understanding of this strong soul were dedicated unreservedly to the cause of Christ.

The consecrated hands receive the pastoral staff, the emblem of the Shepherd: "Feed My Lambs, feed My sheep!" The ring is put on his finger—espousing him to the Bride of Christ—pledge of undying fidelity to his mystic Spouse, the Church. Upon his head is placed the miter—"the helmet of protection and salvation"—the anointed leader of God's people.

Standing upon his episcopal throne that October day in 1892, his soul, newly formed and fashioned by the spirit of the Holy Ghost, stood forth radiant in the grace of his consecration and strong in the fortitude that is the very strength of God!

Home to Bishop Beaven, in that holy hour, deep in the sanctuary of his noble soul, comes that message, whispered in the silent depths of his being, that enlightened his mind, strengthened his will and fired his soul. The message that was spoken to an Augustine, to an Ambrose, to a Gregory the Great, to a Leo, to a Benedict, the soul-stirring message straight from the Heart of Christ to His chosen vessel of election, that has fired the world, "renewed the face of the earth," the pentecostal gift, "*Labora sicut bonus miles Christi Jesu*": "Labor as a good soldier of Christ Jesus."

The Christian world today bears witness to the heroism of these labors, and to the fruit of that gift of the Holy Ghost. The diocese of Springfield for the past twenty-eight years has known what this fortitude has meant in the life that has now ceased its labors.

The "lambs" committed to his care have not been left the prey to ravenous wolves by this shepherd. Fearlessly he has championed the cause of their Faith. Who shall count his journeys up and down this field of his pasture, in quest of the little ones of his flock, gathered now to the number of 34,000 into seventy-three parochial schools? Who shall tell the solicitude that has gathered up to his breast with his right arm the well nigh 1,000 orphans to whom he was all in life?

Bishop Beaven's presence was ever the reward to those heroic women, whose lives were devoted to the care of the children, the hope of the flock, and come what would, the graduation exercises of these children must ever find him present to cheer, encourage and inspire for life.

#### DEEP INTEREST IN EDUCATION.

"Feed My Lambs": The danger or even the remote possibility of danger to the spiritual life of his children, roused within him the courage and fearless bravery of every fibre of his being. Rallying his forces round about him in an organization that challenges the admiration of those not "of the household of the Faith" and that was a strong, irresistible force against those who would seek to invoke civic legislation endangering the solidarity and the perpetuity of Catholic education, he stood forth in his noble, undaunted, uncompromising fortitude. The shepherd's staff ever gently guided the lambs of his flock, upon whose brow his hands had been laid in blessing and in the anointing, that gave them in turn of that fortitude that is the indelible mark of the soldier of Christ Jesus.

The Sisters of St. Joseph, the Sisters of Mercy, the Sisters of Notre Dame, Sisters of Providence, the Xavierian Brothers, dedicated to the educational works, the works of mercy and charity, in gilds, orphanages, houses of the Good Shepherd, hospitals, asylums, homes for the

aged poor, homes for working girls—this army of men and women, consecrated to God, tell the eloquent story of the works that have been planned and executed by this man of God. His interest was in their labors, his cheering smile and hearty laugh oftentimes lifted a heavy burden and gave new courage for the duty that was before them. He was as Christ to them.

The Bishop of Springfield was a patriotic citizen, whose heart was alive to every interest of his country and whose deep concern was so clearly evidenced in the dark days of the war. His chief virtue did not seek the publicity of platform or the wider fields of the press. His schools all up and down the diocese, his parishes, his organizations, gave the fullest measure of devotion and service under his leadership and inspiration. He followed with marked keenness of perception the trend of the times. The problems of our Commonwealth were always the object for his concern and conversation. Never obtrusive of his own opinions, he gave due consideration to the views of others with a breadth of mind that was indicative of the man he was. He was ever a bishop first.

In no phase of Bishop Beaven's life did the virtue of his episcopal character stand out in such commanding attention, as in the administration of his diocese. Here more than anywhere else is seen the heroic courage of his soul. He was a man of prayer, his morning meditation faithfully performed in his little chapel, his frequent visits to the Blessed Sacrament, his communion with God, gave him a familiarity with God, and the spiritual life that was reflected in the great poise of his nature and the confidence he manifested in the watchful Providence of God over his diocese.

#### HIS ABLE ADMINISTRATION

Three churches claimed his attention in Springfield when he became bishop. Now seventeen churches evidence the growth of Catholicism in the episcopal city. There is an enrolment of 377 priests administering to the spiritual needs of a Catholic population of the diocese of 322,750.

Bishop Beaven's administration of his diocese was marked by a wondrous system of efficiency and organiza-

tion. He was painstaking and thorough and gave to each parish his undivided attention. Its school was his first concern. Its financial status was clear and well-defined. He was masterful in the comprehension he had of the details of each parish and his remarkable memory stored up this information for his future use.

To speak to him of his diocese was to touch the chords of his heart. He was manifestly pleased when one spoke of its flourishing condition, of its complete equipment, of its monuments to charity, mercy and education. His heart was in his diocese, he had no other interests in life, he had no other thoughts. In season and out, he toiled and labored in this field of his appointed mission. Nothing that concerned the diocese of Springfield could be foreign to his heart. He loved it! He spoke of it with affection and love and he ever turned back to God, the fruits of his labors.

The Bishop and his priests! What a beautiful chapter in a beautiful life. It was a side of his character few of the laity had any knowledge of. In their gatherings he sat among them, as one of their own in this recreation of his brethren he enjoyed himself with a heartiness that often found expression in some pleasantry that all appreciated. His priesthood was the apple of his eye. Their selection and formation in the seminaries in this country and in Europe was his careful study. Ample opportunities were afforded them to pursue higher courses of study in theology, philosophy, Scripture.

His glory was the priesthood of his diocese and the devotion, love and honor in which the priests of the Springfield diocese are held by the Faithful, and those too, not of the Faith, attest the solicitude and care that the Bishop had for his clergy.

When the call came in at the outbreak of the war for chaplains, the diocese of Springfield was the first next to the Archdiocese of New York to send more than its full quota of army chaplains. Over ten priests donned the khaki and took up their hard heroic work with the soldiers in camp, on transports, in army hospitals, even in the first-line trenches. Seemingly as though it were but just, seemingly as though reflecting the heroism and fortitude of his

Bishop the last officer to die ere the signal was sounded for the armistice, was a priest of the Springfield diocese, killed in the act of presenting a large American flag to his commanding officer, in token of victory. A brave priest, a noble brother of a noble priesthood, a worthy soldier-son begotten in Christ Jesus of our heroic soldier-Bishop! "*Labora sicut bonus miles Christi Jesu.*"

#### AFFECTION FOR HOLY CROSS.

There is one spot in the diocese of Springfield to which the great heart which is now still ever turned with a devotion and a love that was sincere, warm and deep. Eight years of his boyhood were spent on the hill of Mt. St. James, and from the day in 1870 when he went out into life with his degree of bachelor of arts in his hands until last June, when he celebrated his golden jubilee of graduation, his heart's warmest affections were for Holy Cross.

Often on the steps of Commencement Terrace has he given expression of that love and admiration for his alma mater. Her progress was ever a source of consolation and joy to him. Her anxieties and needs were ever the object of his true solicitude. His keen eye saw clearly some 10 years ago the problem that was confronting her. He knew full well the slender resources of her treasury; he saw with clear vision the mission that was hers, as the foremost classical college of New England. He realized what that bulwark was to the Faith of the Church and how that, in great measure, vocations to the priesthood of his diocese came to him from that college.

Hence with a magnanimity unparalleled and with a proof of his zeal for Catholic higher education, he went before his priests with the needs of Holy Cross and Beaven Hall erected on Linden Lane will ever be a testimonial of the generosity and a monument to the zeal of the Bishop and the priests of the diocese of Springfield.

So long as a stone shall stand upon a stone on the hill of Mt. St. James, so long as a son of St. Ignatius shall teach in the halls of Holy Cross and stand before the altar of God to offer up the Blood of the Lamb, shall the name of Holy Cross's second founder be remembered.

Soldier of Christ Jesus, thy labors are over! Soldier of Christ Jesus, the day is done; the battle has been bravely fought and won! In the midst of thy labors, with thy hands to thy work, thou hast been called home. Sixty and nine have been the years of thy life, days that in the blessing of health and strength have known no surcease of toil. Tower of strength in the conflict, thy helmet of protection and salvation has been our courage in weakness; they shepherd's staff our guide in life!

Soldier of Christ Jesus, true shepherd of the flock, moulded in the heart of God with all thy works in thy hands, enter into thy victory, the kingdom that knows no end, where Christ Jesus is king.

---

### **The Ethical Aspect of the Hunger Strike**

P. J. GANNON, S. J.

*Reprinted from "Studies."*

**T**HE moving drama of Brixton jail<sup>1</sup> has again focused attention on the question of the hunger strike. And though the conscience of the Irish nation in general has by now come to endorse this method of protest against the evident and extreme injustice of British rule in Ireland, there are many individuals left who question the abstract morality of refusing food even unto death. A few considerations, therefore, on this vexed point may not be out of place.

It will make for clearness if we first set aside certain aspects of the question about which there can be little

---

<sup>1</sup>Alderman T. MacSwiney, Lord Mayor of Cork, was arrested on August 12, while presiding over an arbitration court in the City Hall. He was tried by court-martial and sentenced to two years' imprisonment on three charges:— (1) Having under his control a police cipher; (2) having in his possession a document likely to cause disaffection. (This was a resolution of the Cork Corporation pledging allegiance to Dail Eireann) (3) having in his possession a copy of a speech he made when elected some months previously. (This speech had been published in the press at the time of its delivery.)



doubt. No distinction is better known to moral theologians than that between the objective and subjective morality of an act. The former consists in its conformity with the Divine law as such; the latter in the conformity existing in the mind of the agent between his act and the Divine law as he understands it to apply here and now. Under ordinary circumstances in the case of a well-instructed conscience the two norms of conduct correspond. Further, it is the duty of everyone to examine carefully his course of action in the light of objective principles and to make sure, as far as may be, that he is not the victim of hallucination. But it may happen, and, in the complexity of life, often does happen that a person can be in perfect good faith even where objectively the act is not conformable to Divine law. In such a case the relations between the Creator and His creature are decided by the subjective dispositions of the latter, and sincere good faith redeems from guilt an act that may perhaps in itself harmonize but ill with the Divine law. That the Irish hunger-strikers are in this disposition at least is too evident to need elaboration here. But this does not solve the question as to whether in point of fact the hunger strike violates the Divine precept of self-preservation, that is to say, whether it involves the guilt of suicide. This is the problem.

Now we may clear the field of argument by setting aside the case of a person legally condemned by a legitimate and acknowledged authority to a just punishment. Whether a real criminal could have recourse to this method of escape need not detain us; still less whether in such circumstances a legitimate government, acting according to legal forms, could let the guilty die. The whole essence of the present position is that an executive, repudiated by the Irish nation, claims the right to arrest and imprison, with entire disregard of constitutional forms, the very men who do represent the will of Ireland and are endeavoring to vindicate her liberties.

And this consideration invalidates at once the objection that the hunger strike will make all legal sanction impossible. It will only kill at best the immoral and illegal sanction of bayonet law. Undoubtedly it is a new and very formidable weapon in the hands of weakness at bay and

an ugly portent for the old imperialisms. But that it will weaken the arm of a legitimate government acting justly is neither demonstrated nor demonstrable.

We may further set aside the case of an innocent prisoner playing a game of bluff against an unjust executive and not intending to push the hunger strike as far as death. It is hard to see how such a victim sins by the inception or continuance of the bluff, even though a certain risk of unexpected collapse is involved. In a righteous cause a man can risk his life though he may not take it. Otherwise the heroes who sleep in Flanders, instead of in the garden cities promised at the General Election, would all be suicides, and even Mr. Shortt would resent this implication.

### IS HUNGER-STRIKING SUICIDE?

There remains the real difficulty. What if one is determined to carry the strike even to the point of death, or actually does so? Is this suicide? Now suicide is defined as *directa sui ipsius occisio*, the direct taking of one's own life. Some authors add the limiting clause *privata auctoritate suscepta*, undertaken on one's own authority, to avoid deciding against the opinion, which St. Alphonsus and others hold probable, that a person justly condemned to death may be empowered by the judge to execute sentence on himself. Suicide, so defined, is never lawful according to Catholic teaching. If therefore the refusal to take food is a direct slaying of oneself on one's own authority, it is indefensible. But is it this? It is needless to say that it could be suicide. To abstain from food *in order to put an end to one's life* would doubtless be sinful. The primary intention here is death, and abstinence from food is the means chosen to compass an illicit end. But no hunger-striker aims at death. Quite the contrary; he desires to live. He aims at escaping from unjust detention, and, to do this, is willing to run the risk of death—a very different frame of mind. And even if he carries the protest to its fatal conclusion, he is still not seeking death, of which he has no desire, not even as a means. His object is to bring the pressure of public opinion to bear upon an unjust aggressor to secure his release,

and advance a cause for which he might face certain death in the field. There is nothing here of the mentality of a suicide, whose object is to escape from a life that has grown hateful to him.

In this context there are two passages of Suarez which help to elucidate the present problem. The first is in his treatise "*De Legibus*" (bk. iii. ch. 30, n. 11) which runs thus:

A confirmation of this [*i. e.*, that the State can demand works of supererogation involving danger of death when the common good requires them] is found in the reply that the precept of self-preservation really involves two precepts, one negative which binds ever and always, namely, not to take one's own life, and against this human legislation can give no command; the other positive, namely, to take steps to preserve life and avoid death, which does not always bind, but often can be neglected, not only to observe a law, but also in the interest of friendship or for other honorable reasons and causes; and thus human legislation can oblige to the neglect of self-preservation on account of the observance of a law necessary for the common good.

Earlier in the same context (n. 10) he had written: "In a case of extreme need from famine or shipwreck a person could lawfully subordinate his own interest and surrender bread or a spar to a friend in like emergency."

The second passage occurs in "*De Legibus*" (bk. vi. c. 7, n. 9), where he is illustrating his contention that by *epikeia* a person is often excused from the observance of a law which involves too much hardship in the given circumstances. It may be rendered:

Similarly a person justly condemned to death by starvation is not bound to abstain from food, if he can obtain it, though he may do so without sin, if he wishes. Thus in the Carthusian institute the precept of abstaining from flesh meats, even if it were a strict law binding of itself in conscience, could be neglected without sin on account of the danger of death, yet it is most probable that it could be observed even then if one wishes to use such vigor with oneself.

We have here from the *Doctor Eximius* a very pertinent distinction. The precept of self-preservation is two-fold: negative in so far as it forbids the direct action of self-slaughter, which is never permissible; positive in so far as it imposes the duty of taking ordinary precautions to preserve life among which the taking of food is certainly included. But this precept, like all positive precepts,

sometimes ceases to bind and can for sufficient reasons be neglected. Among the reasons he suggests are such relatively minor ones as to preserve a religious rule intact or serve a friend.

#### THE TEACHING OF LESSIUS.

If we compare Lessius' "*De Iustitia et Iure*" (bk. ii. ch. 9, dubitatio 6), we find similar principles laid down. In No. 27 he writes:

I say in the second place that, though one may never slay oneself directly, it is lawful when there is a just reason, to do or omit something from which it is certainly foreseen that death will ensue indirectly. So hold in general the doctors to be cited below. The reason is that it is not forbidden to a man ever to expose his life to danger, or commanded that he shall always endeavor to conserve it, but only forbidden to destroy it deliberately as distasteful to him, or to expose it to danger or cease to conserve it without reason, for then he would be held to end it intentionally.

In n. 29 he writes:

In the third place a man condemned to death by starvation can abstain from food secretly offered to him, as is rightly taught by Henriquez, Sotus, Lopez. It is strange that Arragon and Victoria deny this, while they hold that a criminal is bound to drink poison if condemned to do so. For one who drinks poison does an act directly causing his death; whereas a person by not eating does nothing to himself, but only permits his life to be consumed by internal fever (*calore*), and merely fails to conserve his life, for which he has a sufficiently grave reason, that is to conform to a just sentence. And this is confirmed by the fact that if a person in extreme necessity had only food offered to idols at hand he might abstain from eating it, and prefer to die, as St. Augustine teaches (Letter 154 in fine). . . . Fourthly, if two are placed in extreme necessity, one can yield the other the bread by which he could preserve his life, and allow himself to die; for he has a just reason for not eating, namely, the duty of charity towards his neighbor.

If charity towards a single individual be held an adequate reason for not eating and thus sacrificing life, it would seem that love of one's country, which is really charity towards the millions of one's countrymen, constitutes a far more valid excuse for neglecting the positive precept of preserving life. But it should be added that if once we admit the distinction between an act directly destructive of life (which falls under the negative pre-

cept, "Thou shalt not kill") and the omission of an act necessary for life (which falls under the positive precept, "Thou shalt take ordinary means to sustain life"), the further question as to what constitutes a sufficient motive for neglecting the positive precept concerns primarily the persons who make the sacrifice. They may be foolish in thinking the liberty of Ireland worth a single life, though the liberty of Belgium was proclaimed worth millions of lives; they may be wrong in assuming that they are struggling for Irish liberty at all, though the error is shared by about 80 per cent of their countrymen. What concerns us here is that, whether right or wrong in their political views, their action under the circumstances can hardly be called suicide.

The layman may find the distinction given above, on which the solution of the difficulty depends, hard to grasp. An example will make it clear. A Catholic is bound to profess his Faith. This involves two things: first, the negative precept not to deny it, which he may never do even if loss of life or property be the result; secondly, a positive precept to make actual profession of it, which is not always urgent. Thus today in Belfast our harried co-religionists may not deny their Faith, but they are certainly not bound to go about Sandy Row proclaiming, "I am a Papist." They could even disguise themselves under the dongarees of Workman and Clarke's rowdies in order to slip through the bigot lines and escape. That is to say, the obligation of the negative precept is never in abeyance; the obligation of a positive precept is sometimes in abeyance; it may lapse for adequate reasons.

The following example, also, is a close parallel to the hunger strike. A woman whose honor was in danger might certainly throw herself into a river and try to swim across. Let us suppose now that Caliban cannot swim and stands baffled on the bank, but that Miranda discovers when in the water that the current is too swift and the river too wide. What is she to do? Return to the bank where outrage awaits her? If she felt confident that she would give no internal consent, she might licitly do so. But is she bound? I think most moral theologians would deny such an obligation, and it seems fairly clear that she

might commit herself to the current and thus perish a martyr of chastity.

Let us suppose, again, not a woman in danger of dishonor, but a dispatch rider carrying very important dispatches who similarly plunged into a stream to escape a patrol which cannot swim. Let us assume also he has no means of saving his life except by returning to the bank where the enemy awaits him and that in the water he can neither remove nor destroy the despatches. Must he swim back and perhaps lose a battle to his country? Surely not. Yet swimming back is for him as much an obligation as taking food is for a prisoner unjustly jailed. The parallel seems in its ethical aspect entirely complete; and if such a soldier would be deemed a hero and perhaps awarded the V.C. after death, on what grounds should any moral obloquy attach to the hunger protest of the Irish political prisoners?<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>A leading article in the *Times* of September 2 may be cited in proof that even political adversaries attach no moral stigma to the hunger-strike: "The Lord Mayor of Cork is still alive. Twenty days have elapsed since he began his hunger-strike, but, if the reports of his friends are accurate, his death cannot be far distant. There is no sign of any change in the Government's declared purpose to let matters take their course; yet the volume of protest grows ever louder. It comes from many sources, which would have been silent had any complicity in Irish outrage been proved against him. Indeed, public feeling against the perpetrators of crime in Ireland has never been so strong. But the public, with its broad standards of fair play, demands no vengeance upon this individual. Despite the Government, the Lord Mayor of Cork has stirred imagination and pity. Argument on the merits of his case has become subordinate to those sentiments which the dramatic spectacle of a man confronting death for the sake of an ideal was certain to evoke among Christian people. Alderman MacSwiney, a man whose name was unknown outside his own city, will, if he dies, take rank with Fitzgerald, with Emmet, and with Tone in the martyrology of Ireland—his memory infinitely more eloquent and infinitely more subversive of peace than he himself could ever be. Beyond Ireland his death must sweep aside every petty argument and suspicion, and invest him with a dignity from which no subsequent explanations can ever detract."

## Military Rule in Ireland

ERSKINE CHILDERS

*From the Toronto "Statesman"*

**I**N a recent article in the *Daily News* I said that I was prepared to substantiate in detail the grave charges I made against the military and police in Ireland. The editor now invites me to write a short series of articles describing "actual experiences of military rule in Ireland," and I comply.

I wish, by way of preface, to say these things. First, I emphasize this—that the regime, some of whose incidents I describe, constitutes an organized war upon opinion which, though intensified by degrees, was in steady and pitiless operation for nearly three years before it began, early in 1919, to provoke reprisals from among this tortured people against the agents of the executive.

Secondly, I make no personal charges. It would be difficult in any case, because secrecy is the soul of the whole regime, and the soldiers and police who burst into dwellings and offices refuse their names, show no warrants, and adopt in every respect the mentality and procedure of war. But that is not the point. What I want is to awake responsibility in *you*, to remind you that the Castle—"every crumbling brick of it embrowned with sin and shame"—is yours; its aims, agents, and methods yours. I want to show you whither you must inexorably descend when you set out to eradicate a national sentiment by armed force.

Thirdly, I can only lift a corner of the veil. The sum of suffering gallantly and for the most part silently borne by Irish people during the last four years, passes computation. Raids upon private houses, for instance, which are minor features in the regime, number over 20,000 in the last two years alone.

I begin with some examples where hardship to women and children is the chief feature. All are recent Dublin cases, and all have been the subject of scrupulously careful investigation.

Mrs. Maurice Collins was within five weeks of her confinement when her house at 65 Parnell Street was

raided at 3.30 a. m. on January 31 last. The usual thunder of knocks was followed by a demand in vile language for entry. Mr. Collins runs down in time to save his door, and is arrested on the spot. In the ensuing search the officer insists on examining the bedroom of Mrs. Collins, who has jumped out of bed in a state of nervous terror. He is sorry, he says, but it is his duty. Her husband is carried off to gaol under 14B—the *lettre de cachet* section of the Defense of the Realm act—and eleven days later is deported suddenly to England. At the news she collapses, is prematurely confined, and becomes dangerously ill. The fact being verified by the authorities, he is allowed home on parole for three weeks, due to expire on March 5.

But on the morning of the 3rd there is another raid, and, in the afternoon, a third, with forty soldiers and two police. Once again they insist on searching the lady's room, and the effect on her is so serious that Mr. Collins receives an extension of parole till the 12th. On the 10th, at 1 a. m., as though there were a method in this madness of militarism, a fourth raid falls on the house, and once more the officer gains entry to the sick room, in spite of vehement protests; for the lady's nerves are now utterly unstrung. As a concession, he enters alone, leaving the fixed bayonets outside. But this is the climax; there are pitiful screams at every movement—the flash of his torch, the opening of a wardrobe door. . . . Women of England, you have votes and power; this is *your* responsibility.

On a statement by the doctor to the Castle that he will not otherwise guarantee the lady's life, Mr. Collins is allowed to stay till March 25, and then goes back to the English gaol. Neither she nor he know, or are intended to know, when they will meet again or why he is imprisoned. Like hundreds of others, he will have no trial, because, as the Government admits, there is no evidence.

#### A CONSIDERATE RAID

Take now the case of Mr. and Mrs. Sean MacCaoilte, of 54 Marguerite Road, Glasnevin. This is an ordinary,



humane raid, as raids go, and I wish I had space to quote in full the lady's account of it, to show the point of view of an average sufferer among thousands, the restrained, simple language, and the anxiety to recognize all evidences of considerate conduct. Her baby was six days old (the other children being two, four, and five years of age) when, on March 13 last, the raid came with all its terrifying incidents, the pandemonium at the door, the inrush of bayonets, the sudden arrest of her husband, and the entry of her own room, after vain expostulations.

Mr. MacCaoilte was placed under guard in the hall—note this point—throughout the whole search, but, his wife beginning to cry aloud, her brother was permitted to go to her. For twenty minutes an officer searches her room, while a policeman stands at the foot of the bed “trying to hide his face.” But the search here and in the nursery is considerably made, and the officer “seems to dislike his job” (as an ex-officer I marvel how men can be got to do it at all). Nothing incriminating is found and there is no charge against Mr. MacCaoilte, who is well known as a Sinn Feiner of the pacifist school. His crimes are (1) a passion for the revival of the Irish language, (2) his recent election as a Sinn Fein Councillor on the Corporation; and note this, that for both these crimes, membership of the Gaelic League and public adherence to Sinn Fein, both these bodies being “illegal association”—he might, if the Castle pleased, have been condemned by court-martial to a fixed term of gaol. It suits their propaganda and policy better to put him away indefinitely under 14B on “suspicions” utterly without foundation.

The next case is that of Mrs. Robert Brennan, of 10 Belgrave Road, Rathmines, whose husband is hiding from arrest, a marked man for no reason save that he is a responsible literary worker for the Republican cause, to whose integrity, broad-mindedness, and charm of character all who know him will bear witness.

His young wife, alone in the house with three little children, is roused by knocking on the night of February 27 last, runs down in her nightdress, asks permission to dress, and gets for answer, “Damn you, open, or we’ll

smash it in." In they rush, sweeping her aside, bayonets at the charge. An agonizing time follows. One soldier is drunk, and uses foul language. In spite of passionate supplications to be allowed to go to her children, *she is kept apart under guard while their rooms are searched*, and the search throughout is conducted with a roughness and insolence worthy of veritable Huns. Nothing found. No apology. This is not civilized war.

---

## Why the Church Opposes Masonry

*From "Truth"*

THE Catholic Church is opposed to Freemasonry in the first place for the same reason that she is opposed to Mohammedanism, Methodism, Christian Science, or any form of religion which teaches doctrines, inculcates morals, or offers worship to God in any way save the way she professes and teaches. The Church's fundamental belief is that she is the one and only Church established by God; she alone possesses the whole truth; she cannot, therefore, with consistency, countenance any form of religion which is in any way different from or contrary to her teachings. Freemasonry is a religion; it has a ritual and holds certain doctrines, the belief in which are essential for membership. Its doctrines of belief are the Immortality of the Soul, and a belief in God, who is styled as the "Great Architect of the Universe." They positively ignore Christ; and to ignore Him is to deny Him. Likewise, they deny Revelation, except that "taught by Nature and explained by Reason." "The Oath taken on the Bible," says Pike, an eminent exponent of Masonry, "is but a symbol of Nature." Masonry, therefore, is not Christian, because it leaves Jesus Christ out of its life. Masonic worship is worship to an impersonal god, is far from the Christian conception of religion and is, moreover, pagan.

In the Masonic view, no religion is false, because the rites and dogmas of all religion, Christianity included, are at least symbols of the real truths, of which Freemasonry is the fortunate possessor. Surely, there is

enough in this to repel any Christian who has the smallest knowledge of his Faith.

Freemasonry is condemned not only for what she is, but for what she does. Her professions are not as objectionable as her intentions. As undoubtedly Masonry is naturalistic in tenets just so assuredly is she rationalistic in her tendencies. Even admitting that some Masonic institutions pursued for themselves no purposes contrary to religion and public order, they would be, nevertheless, contrary to public order, because by their very existence as secret societies they encourage and promote the foundation of other even dangerous secret societies and render difficult, if not impossible, efficacious action of civil and ecclesiastical authorities against them.

Moreover, Masonry is both anti-clerical and anti-Christian. It is often alleged in this country that Masonry has no malicious intents, despite what may be said of its atrocious acts in the Latin countries. But such is not true. Freemasonry is one and united throughout the world. There is communication between the lodges of all countries. The Masons themselves acknowledge that the sympathies of Anglo-American Masonry go out to the anti-Catholic and anti-Christian revolutions of Continental Europe. In the United States representative Masons may detest the Church as much as their European brethren, but they cannot or dare not give expression to that detestation in overt acts of hostility.

"Freemasonry," says Pope Clement XII, "systematically promotes religious indifferentism and undermines true orthodox, Christian and Catholic Faith and life. Freemasonry is essentially naturalism, and hence opposed to supernaturalism." Therefore, the Masonic Federation is to be judged not so much by the acts and the things it has accomplished as by the whole of its principles and purposes. Any man with a conscience, in joining a secret society must know to what sort of secrecy he is going to commit himself. Those who have a right to know the state of a Catholic's conscience, have the right to know whether his joining that secret society will be to him a source of spiritual harm or to others an occasion of scandal.

Freemasonry has an oath of absolute secrecy blindly taken; that is to say, without one's knowing to what sort of secrecy he is binding himself. Still more objectionable is the oath of absolute and unconditional obedience, which no one under any circumstance can conscientiously take. The oath of the first degree, taken on the Bible, which, bear in mind, they do not regard as the word of God, is in part as follows: "I, in the presence of the Great Architect of the Universe . . . do solemnly and sincerely swear that I will always hide, conceal, and never reveal any part or parts, any point or points of the secrets or mysteries of or belonging to Free and Accepted Masons in Masonry which may heretofore have been known by, shall now or may at any future time be communicated to me." (Gruber in "Catholic Encyclopedia.") No one can in conscience pledge himself by promise or by oath to any duty or obligation the nature of which he does not know. Thus in every respect the Masonic oaths are not only sacrilegious, but also an abuse contrary to public order which requires that solemn oaths and obligations as the principal means to maintain truthfulness and faithfulness in the state and in human society should not be caricatured. Therefore, invocation of the Divine Name, without respect, authority or necessity is blasphemy, and "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." . . .

Our objections to the Masonic order can therefore be summed up as follows: (1) The theological position of Freemasonry, which makes it a religious sect, embodying the sufficiency of theism, indifferentism regarding more specific creeds, and (by implication) a rejection of the divine claims of Christianity. (2) The secrecy of the aims and methods of Freemasonry, which puts its lower members in an unjustifiable position of supporting a cause which is concealed from their knowledge, and which possibly may be evil. (3) The confirmation of this unjustifiable position by an oath, which in itself is wrong for the same reasons.